

Amendment in Reply to the Final Office Action mailed on October 18, 2007
and the Advisory Action mailed on December 10, 2007

REMARKS

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Final Office Action mailed October 18, 2007, and the Advisory Action mailed on December 10, 2007 which have been reviewed and carefully considered. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the amendments made above and the remarks to follow are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-23 remain in this application, where claims 21-23 have been added by this amendment.

In the Final Office Action, claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over WO 02/37411 (Liess) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,525,677 (Printzis). It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-20 are patentable over Liess and Printzis for at least the following reasons.

Liess is directed to an optical input device for measuring finger movement along a window 12 shown in FIG 5a. As shown in FIG 15a, fibers 72, 73 and 74 are optically coupled to diode lasers 3, 5 and 7.

Amendment in Reply to the Final Office Action mailed on October 18, 2007
and the Advisory Action mailed on December 10, 2007

Printzis shows in FIG 5 an optical keypad 400 having a laser source 402 as well as column and row of optical sensors 410, 412. Several mirrors are provided in the path between the laser source and one of the optical sensors. Printzis does not have any window for any moving object.

It is respectfully submitted that Liess and Printzis, alone or in combination do not teach or suggest the present invention as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claims 19-20 which, amongst other patentable elements, recites (illustrative emphasis provided):

wherein at least two paths of the at least two measuring beams from the at least two diode lasers to the window extend through at least two light guides of the optical keyboard, said at least two paths including mirrors and passing through the window.

Two paths that include mirrors and pass through a window is nowhere taught or suggested in Liess, Printzis, and combination thereof. At best, the combination of Liess and Printzis teaches having fiber optics 72, 73 and 74 (FIG 1 of Liess) that do not include mirrors, or optical sensors 132, 134 (FIG 1 of Printzis) that each receives a single path guided with mirrors.

Amendment in Reply to the Final Office Action mailed on October 18, 2007
and the Advisory Action mailed on December 10, 2007

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that independent claims 1 and 19-20 be allowed. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-18 and 21-23 should also be allowed at least based on their dependence from independent claims 1 and 19-20 as well as their individually patentable elements.

In addition, Applicant denies any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicant reserves the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

Amendment in Reply to the Final Office Action mailed on October 18, 2007
and the Advisory Action mailed on December 10, 2007

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By



Dicran Halajian, Reg. 39,703

Attorney for Applicant(s)

March 3, 2008

THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP
Applied Technology Center
111 West Main Street
Bay Shore, NY 11706
Tel: (631) 665-5139
Fax: (631) 665-5101